

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from *Manglapus* in view of *Konishi*.

Initially, Applicant will submit a sworn translation of his priority document shortly, to remove *Manglapus* as a reference against this application, thus rendering moot the rejections of Claims 1-6.

Independent Claim 7 is directed to a storage medium storing a program for controlling a printer server, for receiving a print job from a terminal and outputting the job to an output device. That program includes, at least, the step of correcting the print job based on correction data corresponding to the output characteristic of the output device.

*Konishi* relates to an image forming device and computer, which share the generation of a function for correcting image data, based on an image forming condition for the image forming device. In the *Konishi* system, the following operations are used. If a printer 2 (see Fig. 1) detects a need for calibration, it issues a calibration request to the computer 1. Then, if the computer 1 receives the calibration request, it supplies gradation correction data (a logical density value) to the printer 2. The printer 2 forms a sample image based on the received gradation correction data, measures its density (an actual density value), and notifies the computer 1 of the measured density. The computer 1 forms the gradation correction table 16, which serves as a rule to correct gradations of image information, on the basis of the logical density value and the actual density value (this is the execution of calibration). When printing is performed, the computer 1 corrects the gradations of the image information and supplies the corrected result to the printer 2, on the basis of the correction table 16.

Thus, in the *Konishi* system, the function calibration is achieved by two

devices, i.e., the host and the printer, working cooperatively. (Here, it should be noted that even if the computer in Fig. 1 in *Konishi* is deemed to correspond to the client referred to in Claim 7, the computer 1 of *Konishi* is different from the “server” connected to the clients and the image forming unit.)

In any event, nothing in *Konishi* is believed to teach or suggest the feature, recited in Claim 7, that the correction process is performed by using the correction data *in the printer server* which receives the print job from the client and transfers it to the output device. For at least that reason, Claim 7 is deemed to be clearly allowable over *Konishi*.

Independent Claim 10 is directed to an image processing method which is applied to a server capable of being connected to an image forming unit having a calibration function to obtain correction data by forming and measuring a patch and plural clients through a network. The method of Claim 10 comprises an obtaining step, of obtaining the correction data automatically obtained by the calibration function of the image forming unit by performing communication with the image forming unit. Then, there are a receiving step, of receiving a printing job from the client, and a correcting step, of performing a correction process on image data included in the printing job, by using the correction data obtained by the calibration function of the image forming unit. The method also includes an outputting step, of outputting the image data corrected in the correcting step to the image forming unit.

Claim 10 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Konishi* for at least the same reasons as is Claim 7.

Independent Claims 13 and 14 are apparatus and computer-readable

memory medium claims, respectively, corresponding to method Claim 10, and are believed to be allowable over *Konishi* for substantially the same reasons as is Claim 10.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

ZLP Dian  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29, 296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
NY\_MAIN 169923 v2